



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Knossos, Dr. Arthur J. Evans, and by the personal touch which Professor Burrows contrives to give to the most impersonal questions. Sometimes this mannerism grates a little, as in a reference to "pre-Mackenzian days" (p. 80) and the off-hand application of the *quem deus vult perdere* to Dr. Dörpfeld (p. 79, note 1). In fact, one must wonder what can be the state of mind of an uninitiated reader, for Professor Burrows often refers with scarcely a word of explanation to finds and persons connected with Cretan archaeology, as if all the world enjoyed the intimate acquaintance with them which he shows. It is not easy therefore to determine for what public the book is intended. The earlier chapters contain many popular touches and quotations; the style throughout is chatty, but this conversational treatment of views on Cretan problems pre-supposes in the reader information which is far from general. One may commend the author's desire to reach a large public with an inexpensive volume (p. viii) and yet feel that he has gone too far in letting Cretan discovery speak for itself in only two illustrations (including one on the cover) and three diagrams. The references are full and excellent, but in order to understand the unusual and extreme forms of abbreviation, one must repeatedly consult the bibliography at the end of the book.

HARRIET BOYD HAWES

MADISON, WIS., April, 1908

Aeschyli Tragoedias—iterum edidit revisas HENRICUS WEIL. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907.

We owe to the veteran French scholar Weil a revised edition of his text of Aeschylus which appeared first in 1889. In the preface to this edition Weil reiterates the opinion which he holds in common with Hermann and Ritschl, that our manuscripts of Aeschylus are not all derived from one stemma but some of the younger codices show readings that point to a source independent of that of M.

No one who knows the work of Professor Weil needs to be told that this revision shows scrupulous care and sane scholarship. The changes made from the first edition are most numerous and noteworthy in the Oresteian trilogy. It is interesting to notice the conservative spirit in which the text is treated. Many readings of M. previously rejected are now adopted, and where the text of this codex is so corrupt as to be "hopeless" the editor makes no attempt at reconstruction.

I add a few examples of changes in the text of the trilogy.

Agam. 662: $\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ of the MSS has been wisely adopted for the earlier $\iota\theta\upsilon\varsigma$, and I could wish that η instead of $\tilde{\eta}$ had also been kept. 871: This verse is now admitted as genuine; rightly, as it seems to me. 1343: $\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\eta\eta\nu$ of the MSS is happily restored to the text. 1595: $\delta\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ of the MSS was made $\delta\pi\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ in the first, $\delta\nu\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon\nu$, with Wecklein, in this edition. *Choeph.* 32: Weil cuts out $\phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\varsigma$ (Heath's conjecture) in the text of his first edition, and rejects $\phi\omicron\iota\beta\omicron\varsigma$ of

M., which looks like a gloss on *δνειρβμαντις*. 279: No reconstruction of the text is attempted, in spite of the recent efforts of Blass and Wilamowitz. 498: *λαβας* is adopted from Canter; so also reads Wilamowitz, while Blass keeps *βλδbas*. 691 ff.: I regret to find that Weil still follows Turnebus in giving these lines to Electra. As Wecklein has shown, they clearly belong to Clytaemestra. 883: *ἐπὶ ξυροῦ* of M. is substituted for the unfortunate *συζύγον* of the earlier edition. 1010 ff.: The rearrangement of the verses in the first edition is retained. I am glad also to see the reading *παρ' ὧν* in 1014 for *παρ' ὧν* kept.

Eum. 383-85: Another example of a preference for a reading as close as possible to that of M. 679, 680: Formerly assigned, with Karsten, to Apollo; now to the Chorus, as in M. 885: Weil thinks two trimeters should be added to make the number of verses in this speech equal to that in the speech preceding the choral passage.

M. L. D'OOGHE

Translations into Latin and Greek Verse. By H. A. J. MUNRO. With a Prefatory Note by J. D. DUFF, and a Portrait. London: Edward Arnold, 1906. Pp. xi+113. \$2.

This volume cannot fail to be highly prized by those who admire the traditions of classical education in England, for it is in no sense a patchwork of tags, but rather verse composition sprung from long practice in the art and from sympathetic acquaintance with both ancient and modern literatures. A few of the translations appeared many years ago in *Sabrinæ corolla* and Holden's *Folia silvulæ*; all of them, except Nos. lxxii-lxxiii, were privately printed in 1884, shortly before Munro's death. The passages rendered are drawn from Sappho, Lucretius, Dante, Goethe, and a wide range of English authors, the longest piece being Gray's *Elegy*. Despite great variety of material, every translation shows appropriate style and is cast in a suitable metrical form. In a majority of cases the language and versification are based on Catullus, Vergil, Horace, or the Latin elegiac poets. No. xxx (Hamlet's soliloquy) is an interesting imitation of Lucretius. Fifteen meters are employed, mostly the dactylic hexameter and the elegiac distich. The Glyconics and Alcaics are notable for their exquisite finish. In the latter meter only one verse falls below the best Horatian form, namely:

tellusque circum fervet omnis

(see Havet et Duvau § 365 and Page's edition of Horace's *Odes*, p. xxx *fin.*). In general the canons are strictly obeyed; for example, Munro did not allow himself the freedom of beginning a Glyconic or Pherecratic verse with any movement except pure trochaic; his elegiac distich departs only twice from the rule of the dissyllabic close.

Want of skill in writing Latin or Greek verse is likely to show itself in a complex style, often more difficult to read than a corrupt passage of Propertius. It is therefore no small thing that Munro could write as simply as in this rendering of Burns: